

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4873

tary study of the Communist strategy of peaceful coexistence. In his examination of this area, Mr. Allen analyzed over 500 articles, documents, and speeches of Communist origin representing some 11,000 pages.

The Center for Strategic Studies, Georgetown University, whose director is Adm. Arleigh Burke, U.S. Navy, retired, former Chief of Naval Operations and member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is one of the Nation's outstanding graduate research centers engaged in the study of the multifaceted threat posed by the international Communist movement. This committee is privileged to be able to turn to such knowledgeable and responsible scholars in the field as represented by Mr. Allen and other members of the center for strategic studies.

The committee wishes to express its sincere appreciation to the West Publishing Co., of St. Paul, Minn., which has freely provided the printing and publishing services necessary to produce this study.

Obviously, no single pamphlet or publication will in itself constitute an adequate answer to communism. For this reason, the committee will continue to sponsor quality materials from responsible sources in this complex field.

This study is informational and is not intended as a policy statement of the American Bar Association. We urge leaders of the organized bar, teachers, and civic leaders to acquaint themselves with the facts contained herein. It is the hope of this committee that greater knowledge of the Communist threat will be gained by all citizens, and that the real dimensions of Communist objectives will be more clearly understood in the light of principal strategic pronouncements.

The members of this committee, and its staff which so capably assist in this work, is in accord with our national desire to lead a peaceful existence in conjunction with all nations. But we want to coexist without surrendering for ourselves or for others the concepts of human dignity and the protection of individual rights under a system of due process and the rule of law. Genuine peace is one thing; the charade of Communist peaceful coexistence as a game of quite different intent.

July 1964.

MORRIS I. LEIBMAN,
Chicago, Ill., Chairman.

Standing committee on education against communism

Members: H. Lynn Edwards, Washington, D.C.; Egbert L. Haywood, Durham, N.C.; John G. McKay, Jr., Miami, Fla.; Raymond W. Miller, Washington, D.C.; William C. Mott, Washington, D.C.; Louis B. Nichols, New York City; Mario T. Noto, Washington, D.C.; C. Brewster Rhoads, Philadelphia, Pa.; John Ritchie, Chicago, Ill.; and Jackson A. Wright, Columbia, Mo.

Staff: Boudnot P. Atterbury, consulting counsel; Frank R. Barnett, consulting program manager; Dorothy M. Belina, secretary; Francis J. McGuire, administrative assistant; and Dorothy E. Nicolosi, research assistant.

PREFACE

On both sides of the Atlantic, it is now rumored that the cold war is obsolete, except for the hostility of Mao Tse-tung and his followers. Khrushchev is pictured as a "reformed" Bolshevik, dreading nuclear war and seeking to lead Soviet communism away from world revolution toward the rule of law and middle-class affluence. From this premise, some contend that the West need not strengthen military, economic, and psychological barriers to types of Soviet aggression that may shortly cease to exist. It is urged, rather, that the next order of business is to encourage Khrushchev's "moderation" by pressing for détente and relaxation of trade restrictions with Russia and her satellites. Some statesmen even argue that we should

prepare for the neutralization of central Europe and the eventual disengagement of American forces from the Continent. In short, on the hypothesis of a "peaceful evolving Soviet Union," one new objective for NATO may be to preside over its self-liquidation.

Obviously, few in the West would object to reducing defense budgets if genuine peace were in prospect. But is it? Or is Khrushchev using Pavlov and the hidden persuaders to advance Lenin's unchanging goals? Suppose that the massive "peaceful coexistence" propaganda of the U.S.S.R. and its overseas agents conceal an ambush? Suppose that current interoffice memos of the Communist chiefs and ideologs call not for a reduction in tension but for an increase in class warfare, subversion, and ideological combat? Suppose Communist communiques promise more guerrilla thrusts into the vitals of Afro-Asia and Latin America? Suppose that very recent Communist documents (published after the 1963 Treaty of Moscow) openly reveal how Moscow is again using "peaceful coexistence" as a charade to feint the democracies off guard? Assuming shy motives in the Kremlin (a not unreasonable supposition after 44 years of broken treaties and deceptions), who stands to benefit from another relaxation of vigilance?

Is today's emphasis on peaceful coexistence a new departure for the Kremlin, or is it the repetition of a time-tested gambit for retarding world revolution from temporary positions of weakness? It is useful to appraise Khrushchev's current tactic in the context of history; for, seen in this framework peace to the Communists is simply the continuation of war by other means.

Marx himself believed that Communist and capitalist states were wholly incompatible. Marxism as official dogma still influences the behavior of Communist elites despite the flaws in his prophecy; and Marx taught the inevitability of Communist triumph in the highly developed nations of the West. In a sense, communism deprived of its faith in the necessary obliteration of capitalism would be religion without belief in the certainty of judgment and life everlasting. Marxism must reject any genuine form of peaceful coexistence (on anything more than the temporary basis of expediency) or cease to be.

Lenin, the arch pragmatist of world revolution, taught his cadres how to survive through concession. Confronted by hostile bourgeois states which did not succumb to worker uprisings in the wake of the Russian revolution, Lenin devised the technique of temporary and tactical "peaceful coexistence." At Brest-Litovsk, he signed a formal treaty with Germany which allowed Mother Russia to be dismembered. Still hoping for a chain reaction of revolution now that the "weakest link" had been broken, Lenin made temporary peace with capitalism inside Russia in order to build the economic sinews of his base.

After Lenin's death in 1924, Trotsky contended that "socialism in one country"—a thesis advanced by Stalin—violated the basic principles of Marx and Lenin and betrayed the world revolution.

The savage polemics that preceded Trotsky's exile and assassination in Mexico by the victorious Stalin has obscured the fact that the disputing heirs of Lenin were not nearly so far apart as they seemed. True, Stalin wanted to consolidate power in Russia before risking everything on revolution elsewhere; but Stalin never believed that Soviet "socialism" was an end in itself. More cautious than the theoretical Trotsky, Stalin wanted secure possession of the sturdy lever and most powerful fulcrum for the eventual upheaval of capitalist citadels. Therefore, he became the manager of "planned periods of peaceful coexistence" which enabled not only communism, but also Stalin, to survive.

It is clear, therefore, that even for the patient Stalin, peace was a tactic and not a goal. It gave him time to purge his rivals in the party. It gave him time to collectivize the peasants. It gave him time to industrialize Russia. But even as Stalin led the Soviet Union into the League of Nations, he financed plots, subversion, and popular fronts all over the world. The Communist "peace movements" of the 1930's were designed primarily to ensure that a weak (but developing) Soviet Union would not be crushed from the encircling capitalist powers; they in no way inhibited Moscow's agents from covert operations, industrial espionage, or building international fifth columns.

When Stalin's game with Nazi Germany exploded in his face, he was quick to form alliances with those hated centers of capitalism—England and America—whose arsenals could furnish him with tools of defense. At war's end, he was prepared to exchange token gestures of cooperation with London and Washington for freedom to seize Eastern Europe.

He even dissolved the Comintern in 1943 to underscore the end of Communist subversion abroad, an event hailed in Western circles as the formal termination of Bolshevik ambitions and a sure sign of evolution.

Somehow, the imagemakers have made the buoyant Khrushchev seem less threatening than the cruel Stalin. Thus, we forget how often Western experts on Russia proved Stalin's devotion to peace by citing his reluctance to risk major war and the cynical sacrifice of foreign Communists to the interests of Russian foreign policy. In retrospect, evaluations of Stalin's foreign policy as peace oriented seem naive. Yet, ironically, the dread hand of Stalinism was more constrained to avoid world war than the flexible fingers of Khrushchev, who sought recklessly to engineer a nuclear ambush from Cuba. (For that matter, despite the inflammatory words, Red China's relative restraint with respect to invading the offshore islands, Taiwan, India, and Southeast Asia shows Peiping is not much more adventurous than was Moscow with its wall in Berlin, its rocket threats over Suez, and its hidden missiles in Cuba.) That Khrushchev, like Stalin, often tempers an activist foreign policy with prudent regard for the future of Russia only underlines the essential continuity of Soviet strategy from Lenin to the present.

Communist philosophy, consistent Soviet behavior over four decades, and recent party directives combine to show that peaceful coexistence is a carefully formulated strategic course of action designed to attain revolutionary goals at minimum cost and with minimum risk to the headquarters of the conflict elite.

It behooves the American people, therefore, to ask the question, "Cui bono?" Who benefits, and how, from the illusion that Khrushchev is different not only in degree but in kind from Stalin or Mao? Or perhaps we should ask Lenin's question, "Who is doing what to whom?"—relevant to the cooperation of Communists with their antagonists.

CONCLUSION

Communist actions and Communist words prove that Communist goals are unchanged. The danger may well be greater now, in our moment of one-sided relaxation, than in the tense days of naked Stalinism. The "split" between China and the U.S.S.R. may be of benefit to freedom in the long run. In the short run, polycentrism in the Communist world means we are menaced by two competing strategies: (1) the revolutionary violence of Chinese-oriented Communists in Afro-Asia and Latin America; (2) the more sophisticated Popular Front subversion of Russian-aimed Communist factions. Moscow and Peiping agree that capitalism and

A4874

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 24

human liberty are still the primary targets. Both subsidize class war, ideological war, and guerrilla war, while debating with each other as to whether we are a paper tiger or a nuclear lamb. There is no evidence, in Communist documents or actions, that U.S. policy can be safely based on hopes for genuine accommodation or convergence. Quite to the contrary, Moscow and Peking both assert that capitalism must be forced to disappear from the earth. Their debate is, "How and When?"

Nevertheless, the Communist bloc has weaknesses: industrial, agricultural, ideological, and political. It is vulnerable to economic sanctions and political warfare. Its disregard for human dignity saps its vitality. Communist Parties all over the world can be embarrassed, isolated, rendered impotent. Until there is genuine change in the goals and techniques of Communist dictatorship, the United States must maintain a shield of invincible military deterrence. From behind that shield, we should use our own propaganda sword to quarantine, divide, and undermine aggressive Communist power. That no genuine change in Communist aims has as yet been effected is abundantly clear from the analysis of current Communist documents which follows:

"As soon as we are strong enough to defeat capitalism as a whole, we shall immediately take it by the scruff of the neck."—Vladimir Lenin, 1920.

"A fight is in progress between these two systems, a life and death combat. But we Communists want to win this struggle with the least losses and there is no doubt whatsoever that we shall win."—Nikita Khrushchev, 1963.

THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
AGAINST COMMUNISM.

Justice From the Streets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1964

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I have been immensely impressed with the observations of a native South Carolinian as reported by Marguerite Higgins in the "Point of View" column of the September 21 Washington Evening Star.

Without entering into the difficulties that may exist in South Carolina politically, I feel that these expressions are consonant with the feeling of a great many people in our Nation. We cannot proceed on any program of progress, any program of constructive education, any program of prosperity—which I suppose means the elimination of poverty—with justice coming from the streets. Rioting and looting are too often the handmaidens of protest that graduates to violence. We must have law and order that is commensurate with the dignity of this great Nation that espouses freedom of the individual, his right to progress, his right to education and his freedom to achieve that of which he is capable. Any diversion from this format is, in my opinion, not in agreement with our destiny.

The article follows:

SOUTH'S NEW STIRRINGS AND GOLDWATER'S DRIVE

(By Marguerite Higgins)

GREENVILLE, S.C.—In all fairness, Senator GOLDWATER's tour of the South added up to nothing less than a smashing personal triumph.

But most fascinating now that it is all over is to investigate the reasons and the light they shed on some deep new stirrings in this part of America.

Watching the GOP nominee in action immediately brought to mind the great contrast in campaign styles between President Johnson and Senator GOLDWATER.

President Johnson cries hallelujah—Senator GOLDWATER cries havoc. With the President, it is good tidings all the way and, glory be, a great society just around the corner.

With Senator GOLDWATER, there are intimations of doom—a nuclear gap, a morality gap, a legality gap, a victory gap—and predictions that socialism is going "to get you if you don't watch out," all delivered in the matter-of-fact tones that might be used by a teacher describing how to put together and operate a ham radio set.

FRIENDLY AUDIENCES

With Evangelist Johnson, the audiences have been friendly, often enthusiastic, although in individual conversation they sometimes give the impression of being more against Senator GOLDWATER than for President Johnson.

But here in the Southland, in the case of the matter-of-fact Mr. GOLDWATER, there was evangelism all right—not in the candidate's manner certainly, but in the audiences whose fervor had to be witnessed to be believed. And it is not just a speech-day thing either.

Here in the lovely green foothills of the Carolinas, the Republicans have been working steadily and doggedly. In the Greenville-Spartanburg area alone, they have quadrupled the number of volunteer Republican campaign workers. Crossovers from the Democrats to the Republicans have increased 25 percent over 1960.

VICTORY ANTICIPATED

The rest of the State claims roughly the same percentage of gain. Republican leaders here point out that in 1960, Richard Nixon, with only a skeleton GOP organization, lost to John Kennedy by barely 10,000 votes. So the Goldwaterites think they spy a Republican victory in November because they expect more Democrats to join their ranks, checkmating a probable increase in the Negro vote against Senator GOLDWATER.

Who are these Carolina Goldwaterites? They are the newly minted middle classes—lower, middle and upper—who are the South's new breed.

It is a new breed of self-made men and women who have turned their back on the mores of the decayed southern aristocracy where charm was sometimes held to be more important than accomplishment and where an aristocratic heritage was a frequent excuse for indolence.

This new breed of self-made southerner has come into dominance because of the swift industrialization of the South since 1945—an industrialization so new that it has been free of the slum-making accompaniment of the past.

PROGRESS IS SEEN

Integration, for example, has progressed sufficiently in the schools so that there is a ring of sincerity about it when a Carolinian says: "We are not against Negro rights. We are against the Federal Government's encroachment, not just in the civil rights field but all fields."

What does this new breed want?

By and large, it is not to turn the clock back though there are a few Federal functions that the people would like to see turned back to the individual State. In the main

the South's new middle class wants to put a brake on the Federal Government's power. It is a "this far and no farther" attitude. Social security as presently organized is fine but any drastic increase or change would be opposed.

A SOUTHERNER SPEAKS

But where Mr. GOLDWATER touches these people most deeply is in his philosophy of what America and Americans ought to be. It is not easy to discover a southerner's real feelings because he rarely puts them into words and often is embarrassed to try and do so with newspaper reporters who are regarded automatically as members of the "liberal establishment"—an establishment whose values are viewed as at least partly responsible for what's wrong with America.

As one Republican precinct worker put it: "This country is suffering from a bad case of double standard."

"If there is a riot, these slick liberal writers ooze sympathy for the 'poor rioters.' It's not really the fault of the guy that bashed the cop's head in and broke the store window and stole six television sets, or so we are told. This poor guy just got riot happy because he is living in poverty, the neighborhood is a slum, there is garbage in the alley, or his mother didn't love him enough."

"None of these liberals ever say this rioter is a bum, a criminal and lazy and no good."

"So long as the rioter is treated as a hero and the cop is treated as a beast, the decline of law and order is inevitable. Nobody ever says that tenants can be just as responsible for creating slum conditions as the landlord."

"Why don't they have a clean up and paint up Harlem week? If they don't like garbage in their alleys, why do they dump it there in the first place? My family was so poor that as a teenager I had to be up at dawn milking cows, delivering groceries, and the like."

"I could hardly wait for each day to begin. It was a happy life and it never occurred to me to go and start a riot because I only had one pair of shoes every 2 years and didn't taste ice cream until I was 16."

"Some of America's finest hours were in the days when most of the population was living in what the sociologists would pitifully label as poverty. In those days poverty was not something you started gang warfare over or stole or rioted or killed. It was something that you used grit, self-reliance, and pride to overcome."

"Those qualities were not sneered at then. Now they are sneered at. Pride in country is considered naive."

"It is even considered naive to think that a great power like the United States should have insisted that the Soviet Union live up to its international treaties instead of knuckling under as we so shamefully did when the Berlin wall was built. The more Central Government takes over control of the human being's destiny, the weaker he becomes, along with his moral fiber and his country's moral fiber."

"People like GOLDWATER believe in such things as moral fiber and you Easterners can sneer all you want. He is trying to stop the process of decay and that is why we are for him because we think our lives, our pride, and our human dignity are at stake."

Repression of Jews in the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, for more than a dozen years, there has been

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4875

increasing evidence of anti-Semitic activity on the part of the Government of the Soviet Union. Once prominent and among the leaders of the professions, sciences, and administrators of the Government and the Communist Party within the U.S.S.R., since 1948 Soviet Jewry has been increasingly subject to religious, social, economic, and employment discrimination.

There are estimated to be some 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union, although the number cannot be exactly figured because of many hundreds of leading Jewish intellectuals who were imprisoned in 1948, and of whom many perished. In fact, some two dozen of their leaders were executed in 1952.

Although Soviet practice and, in fact, the Soviet Constitution recognizes the right of cultural and national groups within the U.S.S.R. to maintain and perpetuate their own identities, this right is not accorded to the Jewish community—the only minority group to which it is denied.

Jews are forbidden schools of their own, are not permitted classes in Yiddish or Hebrew in the other schools, and are denied classes in the Russian language on Jewish culture and history. The effect, of course, is to deny Soviet Jews any real opportunity to perpetuate their identity and cultural values. In addition, the Jewish religion is subjected to particular discrimination by forbidding them to maintain national religious organizations, by the forcible closing of synagogues in many areas, and by vicious press attacks against Jewish groups and the few synagogues which do remain. Because the Government controls the press in the Soviet Union, the responsibility for these attacks must be borne by the Soviet Government. In addition, leading officials of synagogues in Moscow and Leningrad have been arrested and imprisoned on charges of espionage. The Soviet authorities usually claim that these men are spying for the State of Israel.

The severe hampering of religious activities, and the antipathy of the authorities toward religious observances is, of course, an official program of the Communists and is directed against all activities which seek to worship a Supreme Being. However, their activities against the Jewish religion in the Soviet Union have been much stronger and show a particular strain of hate and repression.

The proportion of Jews in universities has declined from more than 13 percent, 30 years ago, to about 3 percent today. Official observers believe this has been brought about through a planned policy of discrimination and quotas.

Thousands of Jewish families were broken and spread over other parts of the world as the result of the Nazi invasion. Many of the refugees now live in Israel or West European countries. Yet the Soviet authorities have denied permission to Jewish family members remaining in the Soviet Union to leave the U.S.S.R. in order to be reunited with their families elsewhere.

Despite the full recognition of these, and many more effects of obvious Jewish repression within the U.S.S.R., the

official policy of our Department of State has been, and continues to be, that no official protests should be made to the Soviet authorities. The reason given is that such official recognition and pressure on the Soviet Government by our Government might bring about certain repercussions and retaliation on Soviet Jewry. Obviously, no one can predict what reaction would take place within the Soviet Government to an official protest by our Department of State, but I do feel that the Department's policy, while taking cognizance of this problem, has the effect of sweeping it under the rug. I believe that more official recognition should be taken of Jewish repressions in the Soviet Union, and that more publicity should be given throughout our Nation and the world to the undeniable facts of Jewish persecution by Communist authorities. I call upon the Department of State and all other appropriate agencies of our Government, such as the U.S. Information Agency, to increase their activities in this regard, and I strongly hope that the President will direct them to do so.

Frank L. Auerbach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it was with a sense of loss that I learned of the death of Frank L. Auerbach, Deputy Director of the Visa Office of the Department of State. I had come to know and respect greatly Mr. Auerbach. His career bespeaks his unique talents. He was Immigration Counsel to social agencies in Germany and assistant case consultant to social agencies in the United States. He worked with the War Relocation Authority of the Department of Interior and was a lecturer of both Hunter College and Columbia University in New York City. He began his work with the Department of State in 1948 as a consultant to the Chief of the Visa Division and became Assistant Director of the Visa Office in 1955 and Deputy Director in 1962.

Mr. Auerbach is the author of "Immigration Laws of the United States," "Nationality Problems of Children," "Principles Which Should Underlie our Nationality Laws," "The Admission and Resettlement of Displaced Persons in the United States," and "The Immigration and Nationality Act, a Summary of Its Principal Provisions."

Mr. Auerbach's matchless knowledge of the immigration laws, his compassion, his dedication to his work, his unfailing courtesies to all who sought of his time and his talent, made him the public servant beyond reproach. His death leaves a void in an area where there are too few experts. He served us well and he will not be forgotten.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his wife and children, and to all of the members of his family.

Debt and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, if in these times of economic prosperity our Government cannot balance its budget and limit its spending within the revenues it receives, can it ever do so?

In time of economic adversity and in time of war, expenditures in excess of revenues are frequently necessary. In time of general prosperity, sound fiscal policy requires a balanced budget with provision for the reduction of public debt.

At the beginning of the present Congress, the Kennedy administration presented for our consideration a budget intentionally unbalanced. On February 28, 1963, I reported to the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan my concern about the new economics in the following words:

"Economic theorists close to the President are trying to convince the American people—as they have already convinced the President—that the way to an ever-expanding prosperity is to cut the revenues, increase the spending, and go further into debt.

"It is tragic that the power of government has fallen into the control of those espousing so unsound a doctrine. A prosperity based upon debt is indeed a house built upon sand. Debt is borrowing from the future. In the future, the debt must either be paid or repudiated. There is no third alternative.

"In the experience of us all, debt is a burden and a reduction of net worth. Still, the New Frontier speaks of increasing the national debt as though it were an asset. The President refers to 'increasing the debt in ways that serve to strengthen the debtor.'

"Such strange doctrine is a complete reversal from the sound beliefs of George Washington, who said: 'Avoid the accumulation of debt, not merely by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burdens which we ourselves ought to bear.'

"Washington's admonition was followed in every generation until our own. In these times of relative prosperity, we should be reducing the national debt. The President urges us to increase it. He tells us that the size of the debt may be disregarded. Let it increase, he says, and reduce the income tax to spur what he calls a sluggish economy.

"Now a tax cut is appealing. If we could take home a greater portion of the paycheck, we could purchase more, save more and invest more. But consider what will be the situation if the Government goes on spending without stint. By reason of the tax cut, the tax revenues will be reduced, so, in order to pay for its spending, the Government will

A4876

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 24

have to borrow more to fill the gap between revenue coming in and spending going out.

"If the Government borrows from the people, it will take from them all the increase they thought they would have for use in the free economy. If the Government borrows from the banking system, more dollars will be issued to pay the Government's bills, resulting in inflation. In that case, the expected increase in take-home pay will evaporate in increased prices. If taxes are reduced, there must be a reduction in Government spending; otherwise, there can be no spur in the free economy.

"If our economy is sluggish, as the President says is the case, it is because of the deficit—debt policy of the Government. A government which actually lived within its tax income and systematically reduced its debt would so stimulate the economy that the economy would move forward with confidence and enthusiasm. Then we would experience a sound economic expansion, producing revenues sufficient perhaps to permit a tax reduction."

Now, in 1964, as this Congress comes to a close, it must be recorded that our national debt limit has been increased from \$308 billion to \$315 billion to \$324 billion—in a 2-year period of general prosperity.

We are living off the future when we ought to be living within our means; when we ought to be reducing, not increasing, the national debt.

Complexities of Police Protection Amazes Reporter on Patrol Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the public is concerned with the problems facing law enforcement officers. The public is also rightfully concerned with the disregard for law and order that is flourishing in various parts of the country.

The Enterprise Publications, of Brookfield, Ill., assigned its staff writer, Miss Lyn Daunoras, to cover the police department on a typical tour of duty.

I submit her article for the RECORD as I feel it places the problems of law enforcement in a very practical light and merits our attention:

COMPLEXITIES OF POLICE PROTECTION AMAZES REPORTER ON PATROL DUTY

(By Lyn Daunoras)

It was Saturday, August 29, and I had been given approval by Police Chief Edward Barcal to accompany a squad car from 9 to midnight on its routine patrol of the village.

I sat in the back seat alone with Sgt. Tony Azzarello at the wheel and Police Commissioner Joe Wazny at his side. Along with many other residents, no doubt, I had always assumed that police protection meant merely answering and checking out complaints registered by citizens.

That was a very wrong assumption. Police protection is all-embracing and fantastic in its thoroughness. All residents would find it fascinating to tour with the men in blue as they patrol and protect the village during a shift, looking for trouble, covering bad traffic intersections, checking out business houses, alleys, schools, parking lots, homes questioning loiterers, stopping violators they note with a quick, observing eye, all between investigations of complaints.

In 3 hours, there were only two calls from the police desk to check out. The rest of the time was just touring, touring and checking, checking, checking. Nothing went unnoticed. A young couple sitting in a doorway holding hands was questioned by Azzarello and when he found neither one lived in the apartment house whose doorway they were utilizing, he asked them nicely to move along.

Asked why, since it seemed almost a shame to disturb them, he responded that apartment tenants and landlords complain about persons who do not live in the buildings, taking up the doorway. Sometimes, when tenants want to enter or leave the building and they find couples or gangs sitting on the doorstep, they get abusive language in response to their request to move aside. Therefore, complaints are lessened by getting right to the source.

Groups of teenagers are watched carefully and the grouping is discouraged wherever possible. Reason for this is that another gang, cruising in a car may stop before a group standing around a corner and suddenly a "rumble" erupts. On this night four boys crossing Prairie Avenue joined three others in front of the Purple Plum and they proceeded down Grand Boulevard.

At the same moment the first message from the desk came through: someone had broken the drinking fountain at Kiwanis Park at the base and the water was gushing out heavily. It was possible the four crossing Prairie had come from the park since they were coming from that direction. "I, they're responsible for the destruction, they'll be wet," Azzarello said and drove off in pursuit of the group which he intercepted at Washington.

He stopped, talked to all of them, viewed their identification and checked for any wetness. There was none. None of the boys were from Brookfield; they were all police and cooperative. One 15-year-old had no I.D. and Azzarello asked him why. No reason, just didn't have any, he was told.

Back in the squad, Azzarello questioned the wisdom of parents who allow their children out without any type of identification. He pointed out that a boy or girl walking alone could be hit by a car and taken to a hospital where he might need an emergency operation in order to save his life. A doctor cannot operate or even treat a minor without consent of the parents. How would they locate the parents of an unconscious youth with no identification?

Around the swimming pool we went, checking from every vantage point with flashlight. The spotlight is not used because it tends to scare off persons a block away who might be up to malicious mischief and are thus warned of an approaching squad. The pool was deserted, as was its immediate vicinity.

Going down Shields, Azzarello suddenly flashed his light on the car in front, bringing that driver to a halt. As he talked to the driver, I looked the car over carefully, trying to find why he had stopped him. Nothing appeared out of order. So when he said, "OK, be sure you take care of it now" to the teenaged driver and got back into the squad car, it was our first question.

There was no light over the back license plate. Again he flashed his light at the departing car. "See that?" he asked. Then I did. "In case of a burglary, how could witnesses take the license number? Such a

car becomes a suspicious object. I just warned him to get a light on there." Meanwhile, he had taken the youth's name, address and license plate number and will be checking it out to be sure the light is there next time. Just a precaution that could be a lifesaver at a later date.

Then the second message came through. Resident at 4307 Eberly Avenue reported someone peering into a window. Young, thin man who ran north through the alley. In a whisk, we tore off to Eberly Avenue from Washington and McCormick. In minutes flat we were there, going up and down the streets, side streets and alleys, checking and flashing. There was no one in sight. But Azzarello made a wide sweep around the area, taking no chances of missing anyone about getting away.

And then we went on a round of veritable death traps for police. There were narrow, dark passageways where a squad car would be at a handicap, hidden stairways, high, flat roofs made easily accessible for those hiding out. Azzarello flashed his light down one passageway leading from the alley to the street. "See anything?" he asked. We didn't. Then he lowered the flashlight and the sidewalk belled in the center, making it an ideal place for a person to lie flat.

A policeman unfamiliar with the gully, would flash his light straight through, as he had the first time, and see nothing. "For 100-percent protection, it is absolutely essential for a policeman to be completely familiar with every place in the village," he said.

This, we made a mental note, was another good argument against a metropolitan police force. How would a policeman from Oak Lawn or Chicago know about a gully in a certain sidewalk in Brookfield?

The dangers lurking in the shadows of business houses bothered me, and I asked if business operators were aware of the pitfalls they presented police in the performance of their duties. But Azzarello wasn't complaining. "I consider it a personal challenge," he smiled. "I know these trouble spots so well by now that I feel if anything happens to me, I deserve it for letting it happen."

But what of the new men? There are too many places where they'd be sitting ducks. It's something residents should know about because the protection at every angle given by their police department borders on the unbelievable. Even cobwebs on doorways are examined because they indicate no one has opened the door in 24 hours. Periodically the department or village hall will receive a note of gratitude from a resident who has had first-hand experience in utilizing the services of the department in an emergency.

But emergencies are just a small part of the facets of police work they do not know about and probably will never know about. They can only be assured that Brookfield is one of the best protected suburbs in the county. The fact that only four messages came through in 3 hours on a Saturday night (the other two were handled by the other squad car under Officer Rick Gallas) proves the point.

Of course, this was an unusually quiet evening. The police department averages about 7,000 complaints per year and as of September 1, had already passed the 4,000 mark.

It was obvious that residents do nothing to make their jobs easier. There were open overhead doors on garages, just begging burglars or delinquents to help themselves, cars standing unattended with motors running.

The fact that 60 miles had been put on by Azzarello during his shift from 4 to 12 p.m. and that upward to 100 miles per shift have been put on by squad cars, just within the limits of Brookfield, certainly proves without doubt the vigilant, careful, thorough pro-

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4877

tection given the residents of Brookfield. They'd have to see it to fully appreciate it, but it's a great comfort to know it's there.

Religious Persecution in the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following letter describing religious persecution in the Soviet Union was sent by way of Poland to the editor of Novoye Russkoye Slovo, a Russian-language newspaper published in New York City. It was brought to my attention by Mr. Paul Voronaeff, of Indianapolis, Ind., and its graphic description of intimidation and terror lends little support to the theory that the Soviet Union is mellowing:

To all children of God who compose the church of Jesus Christ—to all evangelical Christian Baptists living in our land, from east to west and from north to south, "Grace be unto you, and peace, from Him which is, and which was, and which is to come" (Revelation 1: 4).

Beloved brothers and sisters in the Lord.

We decided to inform you about a sad event of which we were the witnesses. The grief which we wish to share with you is our common sadness, because we all are one church which is the body of Christ (1 Corinthians 12: 26): "And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it."

January 11, 1964, Sister Maria Ivanovna Chmara, living in Village Kulunda, Altai Region, received information from the prison in the City of Barnaul that her husband passed away. It was confirmed by a telegram communication that she is now a widow, with her four children between the ages of 13 years to 1 month. Her husband, Brother Nicolaj Kuzmich Chmara, born 1916, together with his wife, joined the church in 1963. This short life in Christ was a vivid example of a new life to all with whom he led his former life of drunkenness.

The church at Kulunda, of which he was a member, testifies of him that he sincerely loved the Lord and served Him with all his house. He loved to sing the hymn:

"I was called to work on this earth,
To fight with every idol,
Not looking on the fearful friends,
To be a witness before the world.
And not afraid of the judgment of the men."

It was December 24-27, 1963, that he, with Brother F. I. Subbotin and his brother and sister, B. K. Chmara and L. M. Chmara, appeared before the court and together with others was sentenced for the name of Christ for good and conscientious behavior. After the sentence of the court he spent just 2 weeks in prison, and then the communication came that he is dead.

January 13, 1964, the widow and relatives of the dead, together with us, got from the prison the body of Nicolaj Kuzmich. During the trial by the court, the relatives and friends had seen him in perfect health and cheerful. But what did we see when we got him dead? On his hands are seen marks of chains. The palms of the hands are burned; the fingers and bottoms of both feet are burned. The lower part of the abdomen has marks of wounds made by piercing with a sharp and red-hot object, right leg is swollen,

both feet have pierced wounds, and the body with signs and bruises. When we saw all this we had mixed feelings—of deep grief and joy. Our grief is because our dear brother Nicolaj Kuzmich had to pass through such brutal trials and accept death in the prison walls. We grieve for the unhealed wounds made by godless hands upon the innocent hearts of children. Not for evil deeds, but for good, for love to the people, to the Lord, and for His name, he bore it all as a good soldier of Jesus Christ and was faithful to Him unto death. We are filled with a deep sorrow at seeing the widow and her children crying at the casket, with difficulty recognizing the face of their father. We tried to comfort them and ourselves with the fact that we all have the Father of orphans and widows—and there is a righteous Judge, the Christ.

During 4 days and nights at the casket were many brothers and sisters from afar and from the local area who solemnly conducted services. The funeral service took place in the afternoon of January 16, 1964, with a procession through the town singing hymns and carrying placards which read:

"For to me to live is Christ and to die is gain."

"Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul."

"I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God."

After the burial of the body of the deceased brother we returned to our respective places with thanksgiving and with greater zeal to serve the Lord and to be faithful to Him unto death as our brother was.

Beloved brothers and sisters, we know that the first question that will arise in your mind is—What for? What official charges were presented against him by the court of prosecutors and for what reason was he sentenced to death?

For the answer we present some transcripts from the sentence of Altai Regional Court, Act No. 142, where it said that a group of Baptists conducted illegal meetings under unsanitary conditions, drawing the youth and teenagers into the sect group. Under cover of "cleaning up," they propagated against CUECB (Council of Union of Evangelical Christian-Baptists in Moscow) and its position and kept contact with other likewise illegal groups and other like charges.

This is the definition of the court, according to which Brother F. I. Subbotin was sentenced to 5 years of strict imprisonment; two brothers, Wasilij and Nicolaj Chmara, to 3 years of jail; and their sister, L. M. Chmara, to 2 years with suspension.

Yes, in our days "unusual" things happen. We call your attention: Discuss and tell this to all people who love the Lord. Tell about this to large and small. To all who still fear God and who desire to meet with Christ.

Signed by brothers and sisters of the city of Barnaul, Village Kulunda, 120 persons.

A Tribute to Loren Miller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1964

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, in the recent appointment of Loren Miller to the municipal court of Los Angeles as a judge, well-deserved recognition has been given to one who has assiduously and without personal aggrandizement given of his time and talent to the cause of human justice.

The following article by Paul Weeks, staff writer for the Los Angeles Times, highlights some of his major accomplishments in the field of civil rights, and I am pleased to insert it in the Record:

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 17, 1964]
NEW JUDGE RELUCTANT MEMBER OF PROFESSION: DRAGGED INTO LAW "KICKING AND SCREAMING," SAYS NEGRO NAMED TO BENCH BY GOVERNOR BROWN

(By Paul Weeks)

Los Angeles' newest municipal court judge is a spindly, bespectacled man of 61 who admits he never wanted to be a lawyer.

"I was dragged kicking and screaming into the practice of law because, you know, in those days a Negro could be a doctor, lawyer or schoolteacher—and that's about all," said Loren Miller as he relaxed in his Silver Lake district home late last week.

A few days earlier, Tuesday to be exact, he had been appointed by Governor Brown to fill the unexpired term of the late Judge Ernestine Stallhut.

BEGAN ON FARM

Miller views his rise from Nebraska farm boy to the bench with easygoing, low-key humor. But it's been a long time since Loren Miller was a farm boy setting out to practice law.

Today he is regarded as one of the Nation's great living civil rights attorneys, with a trailblazing history of triumphs, particularly in the field of housing discrimination, behind him.

The most celebrated, *Shelley v. Kramer*, came in 1948 when the U.S. Supreme Court delivered the epochal decision that racial covenants on property cannot be enforced by the courts.

HIGH COURT VICTORY

"That was for a Detroit man who bought a piece of property, and was denied the right to occupy it when it was found he was a Negro," Miller recalled. "We lost that one all the way up—until the Supreme Court reversed it."

Miller said he "guessed" he had tried about 100 racial covenant cases, beginning in about 1939, "before we got that Supreme Court decision."

That was followed by a series of precedent setting legal victories by Miller against housing discrimination. They included: A California ruling that a white property owner could not collect damages from another Caucasian because the latter sold racially restricted property to a Negro.

A 1954 State supreme court decision which forbade the city of San Francisco from following neighborhood racial patterns in renting public housing.

A 1962 appellate court ruling that a landlord cannot evict a tenant because of his race. Miller fought the case for an engineer who had rented a Pasadena apartment only to be evicted when the landlord discovered his new tenant to be a Negro.

In virtually all his civil rights cases Miller has acted as counsel for the NAACP, of which he is national vice president, as well as regional counsel.

In the latter role, he has played a major part in striking down school desegregation barriers, including the case which led to the historic U.S. Supreme Court decision of 1954 which discarded the old "separate but equal" theory.

Born in Pender, Nebr., on January 20, 1903, the second of seven children, Miller was graduated from high school in Highland, Kans. He attended the University of Kansas at Lawrence, Howard University in Washington, D.C., and finally received his law degree in 1928 from Washburn University in Topeka.

MOVED HERE IN 1929

He moved to Los Angeles in 1929, where his mother was then living, upon learning of the

A4878

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 24

death of a sister. For 4 years he was a reporter, first on the California News and then the California Eagle—weeklies circulated in the Negro community.

In 1933, after his marriage, his wife persuaded him to take the bar examination and return to law. Mrs. Juanita Miller is a USC graduate in social work, and is today still carrying on a career of her own as a social worker in the State department of welfare's Los Angeles office.

The Millers have two children, Loren, Jr., 27, also an attorney, of 1319 South Highland Avenue, and Edward, 18, a student at Valley Junior College. Loren, Jr. and his wife, Anne-Marye have two children, Michael, 5, and Robin, 4.

OWNS NEWSPAPER

Miller is one of the few newspapermen to achieve the goal of owning a newspaper, for which he once worked. In 1951, he bought the California Eagle, in which he has regularly written a militant, goading column with a "freedom now!" message.

A Democrat since he voted for Al Smith in 1928. Miller has espoused often unpopular causes (he defended Black Muslims after a violent clash with Los Angeles police) in law and in politics.

ONE OF REGRETS

But one of his regrets as he leaves law practice for the bench is having to withdraw from participation in a case which he feels ultimately will result in invalidation of an initiative measure on the November ballot.

It would amend the State constitution, nullifying all antidiscrimination legislation in housing and blocking future legislation.

Miller is convinced the initiative is unconstitutional—but he and his allies lost preliminary skirmishes to keep it off the ballot.

The Big Gyp That's Costing You \$200 a Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1964

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, frequently issues that are not widely discussed by the American people because they do not know enough about them are the very issues that are the most important.

Such an issue is one that a crusading Texas Congressman by the name of WRIGHT PATMAN has been calling to the attention of the Congress and the people for the past several years. It is the issue of tax-free foundations. Congressman PATMAN, although not of my political party, has been doing a job for the benefit of the country. There is no politics in his operation. I endorse his effort sincerely and heartily.

If there are massive abuses of tax-free foundations and tax evasion on the part of those best able to pay taxes, business manipulations done under the cover of educational or charitable foundations, then it is time for the Congress—Republicans as well as Democrats—to support Representative PATMAN in legislating corrective measures.

An article appearing in *Saga* magazine, October issue, discusses PATMAN's

effort at length. It was written by Fred J. Cook, a first-rate writer who has written books about unsung Revolutionary heroes, crime in New York, Pentagon extravagances, and many other interesting matters. He has never written about a more intriguing subject and he has done it well. Cheers to *Saga* magazine, Fred Cook, and above all, to my good friend and hard-working colleague, WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas.

The article follows:

UNDER AN UMBRELLA OF PIOUS CHARITY LURKS THE BIGGEST, JUICEST TAX DODGE OF ALL TIME

In his long career in the House, he has been one of that body's guttiest fighters for the common man—and against the power complexes of our time: the millionaire industrialists, the huge corporations, the powerful banking trusts. The bigger they are, the harder WRIGHT PATMAN fights them.

Right now, PATMAN is waging the battle of his life on behalf of the little man, which means nine-tenths of all Americans. He is out to apply the coup de grace to what he calls "giants with tax umbrellas," and his opponents are only people like the Rockefellers and the Du Ponts, who consider a million dollars mere pin money. The particular "giants with tax umbrellas" whom PATMAN is fighting are the huge, tax-exempt foundations set up by such great industrial dynasties.

These foundations represent a tax escape hatch that, to PATMAN, is the most vicious and unjust in the whole income tax structure. Through this escape hatch, he says, the extremely wealthy avoid paying anything like their proper share of the tax burden—and the rest of us have to make it up. Just how far down in our jeans do we have to dig to keep the elite in the tax-exempt status to which they have become accustomed? The figures, as PATMAN cites them, are fantastic.

He has uncovered deals in which, by use of the foundation device, individuals have escaped paying taxes on literally millions of dollars in profits.

The total annual loss from such Brobdignagian tax dodgers runs into the billions. And this means that the average man gets scaked—and soaked hard—to make up the deficit. "This year's tax cut would be peanuts compared to what would be possible if foundation frauds were eliminated," PATMAN declares.

PATMAN would like to see the Treasury Department figure out exactly how much better off Joe Doakes would be if he were not helping to pay the taxes of the Rockefellers, etc., but Treasury has exhibited no wild enthusiasm for dredging up the facts. In the absence of such explicit knowledge, the best that can be offered is an educated guess. That guess goes this way: Assume that foundations were required to pay taxes on their gross income like other businesses; then if the much-ballyhooed 1964 tax cut saved you \$100, closing the foundation tax loophole could probably save you double that amount—another \$200. So you are losing, out of pocket, \$200 a year.

The gimmicks PATMAN has exposed show the extent of the abuses. Foundations compete with banks, making multi-million-dollar loans with their tax-free money and often giving highly preferential rates of interest to the donor—or his friends, or his business. They run restaurants, invest in real estate, build and lease gas stations—enterprises in which, naturally, they hold an enormous competitive edge over businessmen who have to pay taxes. In one startling case, PATMAN's researchers found a broker, a member of the New York and American Stock Exchange, using three family foundations (assets: \$28 million) to run an unregulated,

tax-free security enterprise for himself and his fellow magnates.

"There's one wealthy, residential area outside of Philadelphia where virtually every other house has a foundation set up to send its kids to college at the taxpayers' expense," PATMAN declares.

He explained the deal as follows:

Randolph Enterprise Jones is a wealthy industrialist with an income that places him comfortably in the upper brackets. He has a couple of sons who will soon be going to college. So what does Enterprise do? He creates the Randolph Enterprise Jones Foundation to provide scholarships for worthy college students. In anticipation of future need, he takes a nice, round sum, say \$25,000, and donates it to the foundation. For this generosity Uncle Sam rewards him in two ways. Since this presumably qualifies as charity, he pays no income tax on the \$25,000, and in addition, if this burst of benevolence has dropped him into a lower income tax bracket, he saves a further tidy hunk of pocket money on the taxes he pays on his remaining income. Enterprise, as can be seen, is making hay with this deal, and if he can just arrange to recapture the \$25,000, he'll be home scot free. This last step is not too difficult. Enterprise scouts around and finds an obliging college that is positively overawed by the scholastic attainments of Randolph Enterprise Jones, Jr. Then Junior gets the scholarship from his father's foundation—and all his college expenses are paid with tax-free money. The same deal is later worked with son number two, the foundation being kept alive by carefully gaged bequests until there are no more deserving Enterprise Joneses to be rewarded.

"All of this is a kind of city slicker deal," says PATMAN, who comes from the north Texas farmlands. "There are more city slickers in the United States today than ever before, and their deals mount up to a lot more in money. It used to be that the city slicker was working to euchre you out of \$5 to \$100; today, it's millions.

"To the very rich, our tax system is just like passing around the hat. If they want to put in, they can. If they don't, they don't have to.

"Suppose everybody took advantage of this. Suppose every American had his own foundation? You know what would happen? We wouldn't collect enough money to pay the Capitol's police force. We couldn't keep Congress in session. The whole thing would collapse."

Most of us have probably been brainwashed into considering foundations as essentially noble enterprises. Some of them are, of course. At their best, foundations finance important medical research, help care for orphans and the aged, support the arts and education. But there is a huge—and constantly growing—number of foundations whose principal function is to pile up huge fortunes, giving only a pittance to charity as a tax-escape cloak. Such foundations, exempt from all taxation, act in reality as holding companies, dominating huge industrial empires, making the wealthy ever wealthier and more powerful at the expense of the average man.

After a dogged, 3-year probe of what he calls "the foundation mess," PATMAN cites some specific examples:

The Rockefeller foundations.—At the close of 1960, seven Rockefeller family foundations held 7,891,567 shares of the common stock of Standard Oil of New Jersey. (In mid-May 1964, Jersey Standard was selling at \$88 a share and paying \$2.80 annually. This would make such a holding worth \$694,457,896—and would result in \$22,096,387 of tax-free income.) But Jersey Standard was not by any means the only major oil stock in the portfolios of the Rockefeller foundations. They also owned hundreds of thousands of